

**REMARKS:**

In accordance with the following, status identifier of the claims is corrected herein. For convenience of the Examiner, arguments and amendments presented in the July 25, 2005 Amendment are repeated herein.

\* \* \*

In the Office Action mailed February 25, 2005, claims 19, 29, 61, 64, and 109 were objected to and claims 1-18, 20-28, 30-38, 43-60, 62, 63, 65-83, 88-108, 110-128 and 133-135 were rejected.

Claims 19, 22-31, 33-37, 61, 64, 67-76, 78-82, 109, 112-118, 120, 121 and 123-127 are amended herein, claims 1-18, 20, 39-60, 62, 63, 65, 84-108, 110, 119, and 129-135 are cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 19, 21-38, 61, 64, 66-83, 109, 111-118 and 120-128 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:**

At page 12 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 19, 29, 61, 64, and 109 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 19, 29, 61, 64, and 109 are amended herein to be in independent form and include features of intervening claims.

Therefore, claims 19, 29, 61, 64, and 109 are allowable.

**OBJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112¶2:**

Claims 5, 25, 50, 70 and 115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112¶2 as being indefinite. As mentioned above, claims 5 and 50 are cancelled herein without prejudice.

Claims 25, 70 and 115 are amended herein to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112¶2.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):**

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-18, 20-24, 26-28, 30-38, 43-49, 51-54, 56-60, 62-63, 65-69, 71-81, 83, 88-108, 110-114, 116-126, 128 and 133-135 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,615,408 (Kaiser).

Kaiser provides action selections to an image referencing a product in a video production. That is, Kaiser selects contextually appropriate segments to provide an interactive video to a user based on selection of the user (see, col. 2, lines 35-52 and col. 5, lines 39-44). For example, a user selects a product within a video production so that the system tracks the selected product through multiple frames of the video production (see, col. 10, lines 20-41), or executes one of the selectable actions, such as promotion and purchase, to the selected product (see, FIGS. 8 and 9).

In contrast, independent claim 21 recites, “a communication unit transmitting the position on the motion picture, upon receiving the pointing manipulation to a server including a unit recognizing an object in the motion picture receiving the pointing manipulation, and receiving, from said server, information on the object in the motion picture recognized by said server”, where the recognizing of the object in the motion picture is done at the server. Further, as recited in independent claim 21, the control system of the present invention includes, “a processing unit executing a predetermined process related to the object recognized”.

Accordingly, the present invention simplifies configurations and functions of clients are simplified by enabling information with respect to an object in the motion picture to be recognized by a server, thereby transmitting a result of the recognition to the clients. The present invention does not require that information needed for recognizing an object in a motion picture be sent to clients, and thus, reduces the amount of communication traffic.

Unlike Kaiser, recognition of an object according to the present invention is implemented at a remote server. On the other hand, in Kaiser, the functions of trigger zone/placement zone are constructed in the clients (see, col. 8, lines 1-30).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 32, 66, 77 and 111 recite similar features as independent claim 21 and are patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 38, 83, 122 and 128 also recite, “receiving information on the position where the pointing manipulation is effected on the motion picture from said display device”, “recognizing the object in the motion picture receiving the pointing manipulation on the

basis of the information received from said display device”, “referring to an instruction related to the object” and “commanding said data distribution system to change over the data to be distributed in accordance with the instruction”.

It is submitted that the independent claims 21, 32, 38, 66, 77, 83, 111, 122 and 128 are patentable over Kaiser.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Kaiser. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claims 25, 70 and 115, “the first data is constructed with a predetermined data structure and the second data is embedded in a margin formed in the data structure”. The Kaiser method does not teach or suggest a method and system of controlling “the first data constructed with a predetermined data structure and the second data is embedded in a margin formed in the data structure”, as recited in claims 25, 70 and 115.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 10, 55, 82, 100 and 127 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kaiser and U.S. Patent No. 6,847,969 (Mathai). As mentioned above, claims 10, 55 and 100 are cancelled herein without prejudice.

The arguments presented above with respect to independent claims 77 and 122 are incorporated herein to address the rejection of claims 82 and 127.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kaiser does not teach that the task executing device is an e-mail server delivery e-mail, but relies on Mathai as teaching the same. However, Mathai is directed to providing personalized information that is conveniently accessible through a network of public access stations via a personal system access card. That is, Mathai provides personalized services and advertisement and allows a user to receive emails and access other information most desirable in public spaces (see, col. 5, lines 1-17 and FIG. 2).

Dependent claims 82 and 127 recite that “said communication unit communicates with an E-mail server delivering an E-mail, and said predetermined process involves commanding said E-mail server to deliver an E-mail related to the object recognized via said communication unit”.

Kaiser and Mathai, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method and system of controlling a display device including a communication unit "[that] communicates with an E-mail server delivering an E-mail, and said predetermined process involves commanding said E-mail server to deliver an E-mail related to the object recognized via said communication unit", as recited in claims 82 and 127.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 02/24/2006

By:   
Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

|